



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

3 No. Lowell Road, Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

www.WindhamNH.gov

**Draft Minutes Zoning Board of Adjustment
August 9, 2016
7:30pm @ Community Development Department**

Mark Samsel, Chairman - present

Mike Mazalewski, Alternate - present

Heath Partington, Vice Chair - present

Kevin Hughes, Alternate - present

Pam Skinner, Secretary - present

Jim Tierney, Alternate - excused

Mike Scholz, Member - present

Jay Yennaco, Alternate - excused

Bruce Breton, Member - present

Staff:

Dick Gregory, ZBA Code Enforcement Administrator

Andrea Cairns, Minute Taker

Meeting called to order at 7:31p.m. by Chairman Samsel.

Chairman Samsel reviewed the process for the public.

Lot 2-B-300, Case # 25-2016

Applicant Ryan Carr/GRD, LLC

Owner-Lionel St. Pierre & Joann Wing

Location-38 E. Nashua Road

Zoning District-Rural

Variance relief is requested from **Section 702, App. A-1** of the Windham Zoning Ordinance to allow frontage of 152 ft. for lot A and 90.5 ft. for lot B where 175 ft. is required in this district.

Mr. Ryan Carr, the applicant, submitted a letter on 8/2/16 requesting a continuance to the next meeting.

Ms. Skinner read the case into the record. The abutters list will be read into the record at the next meeting.

There was a member of the public present, but would wait to give her testimony until the hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to continue the hearing for case #25-2016 to the 8/23/16 meeting.

Mr. Partington seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries

Lot 11-A-520 & 530 Case # 23-2016 continued from 7-26-2016

Applicant-The Dubay Group

Owner-Village Center Properties, LLC

Location- 13 & 15 Indian Rock Road

Zoning District-Village Center District and Wetland & Watershed Protection District (WWPD).

Variance relief is requested from **Section 706.8** for two (2) free standing signs. Sign A on lot 11-A-530 to be (10) ft. high and 39 sq. ft. in area and Sign B on lot 11-A-520 to be 12 ft. high and 60 sq. ft. in area in the Village Center District, where the maximum height is 5 ft. and the maximum area is 16 sq. ft. per lot and **Section 706.4.3.3** to allow internal illumination of cut-out imagery on the two (2) signs where internal illumination is not allowed.

Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

Chairman Samsel noted they heard testimony about the size of the signs at the last meeting so they would only hear testimony about the internal illumination.

Chris McCarthy and Karl Dubay presented the application.

Mr. McCarthy stated they received conditional approval from the planning board the previous night.

Mr. McCarthy reviewed the five criteria.

Mr. McCarthy stated that some businesses have smaller signs but benefit from large canopies.

Mr. Dubay noted there is a directory sign at the town hall. It is 10' tall and the area is at least 6'x6'. Route 111 crosses many districts but is very homogeneous in terms of traffic. It just so happens that section of road it is the village center district. He does not believe it was the intent to have a 60" sign to take care of a business complex on Rt. 111, when just up the street they are allowed to have very large signs.

Mr. Dubay added that in terms of illumination, they are only lighting the letters and the bank's logo. They could blast it with a large spotlight and have a large backplate, but they are not going that route.

Mr. Partington questioned what the benefit was of the internal lighting versus what is allowed in the ordinance. Mr. McCarthy noted their intent was to make it more elegant and in-line with the buildings.

Mr. Scholz questioned what the backplate was. Mr. Dubay noted it allowed them to make the sign larger—the backplate can be up to 150% larger than the sign.

Mr. Mazalewski joined the meeting.

Susan Hoey – 4 Eastwood Rd.

Ms. Hoey stated they need to keep with town ordinances. There are other signs like McDonalds that are very large. The town changed the ordinance to discourage that within the Village District. She does not want to see Rt. 28 signage on Rt. 111.

92 *Ross McCloud, 4 Nottingham Rd.*

93 Mr. McCloud was seated on the Planning Board when they heard the case. They approved the site
94 plan and granted waivers. He is not representing the planning board. Mr. McCloud stated that when
95 the town voted on the ordinance back in 2002 it was a 3:1 vote in favor of the ordinance. A lot of
96 what was written for the village center district was for the center of the district. This property is on
97 the periphery and is why he supports some of what they are requesting.

98
99 He has concerns about signs getting bigger because they become a distraction. He also noted
100 concern about putting a lot of tenant names on a small sign. They become hard to read. Many of the
101 businesses that will be in Village Place will be the type of business that people already know are
102 there. He also added there are other businesses along Rt. 111 that do not have signage at all and do
103 very well.

104
105 His main concern is the height of the signs; he is less concerned with the length of the sign and
106 questioned if the board could make an exception for the length but not the height. He was in full
107 support of the internal illumination.

108
109 Mr. McCloud added that NHDOT has plans for a 2-lane rotary so the speeds will be reduced to
110 15mph.

111
112 Mr. McCarthy noted several tenants have concerns with the sign capacity. He also added that the
113 NHDOT project is in the 10-year plan so it will not happen right away.

114
115 Chairman Samsel questioned the grade. It appears flat from the road to the signs. Mr. McCarthy
116 noted for sign A it goes from 202' to 204'. Chairman Samsel questioned how they arrived at the
117 proposed height. Mr. McCarthy noted they went with the recommendation of NH Signs. They came
118 to that conclusion because of snow mounds and safety.

119
120 Ms. Skinner read the letters in support of the application.

121
122 Mr. Dubay noted the frontage on the project has 490' of ROW, which is substantial. The district has
123 evolved and if they went with the tables within the ordinance, they could have signs every 10'. He
124 added the building would be set back and up 10' higher than the ground elevation of sign B so it
125 would not look out of proportion.

126
127 Mr. Scholz noted he struggled with sign A. There are only two businesses in there and he is having
128 a hard time with why they would need a variance when there is not the density.

129
130 Mr. McCarthy noted the bank was concerned with visibility. There is a home that is blocking
131 visibility when you are coming from east to west.

132
133 Ms. Skinner noted she has recently driven through several communities and most of the Enterprise
134 Bank signs she saw were fairly small. Why do they need a large sign there?

135
136 Mr. McCarthy noted the typical sign for an Enterprise Bank is a 36" sign. They are very tasteful.
137 The entire sign for sign A is 32" for both tenants, not just Enterprise Bank.

Ms. Hoey noted the look of the signs is great, but it is the size of the sign she is concerned with. They do not want a Rt. 28 and want it in conformance with the town ordinances.

Chairman Samsel asked the applicant to compare the requested size to what is actually allowed. Mr. Dubay noted for sign A they are at 10' high and 32 sq. ft. and sign B is 49.3 sq. ft. and 12' high. They are allowed to be 5' high or 16' high for a complex. Mr. McCarthy noted they would be willing to further reduce the height of the signs from 10' to 8' and 12 to 10' if the height is the sticking point. They want to be flexible.

Mr. Breton noted that the height was the biggest concern for some of the residents. If the height were lowered to conforming standards, it would not be so obtrusive. They could make up for the height by going longer. In general, bank customers know where their bank is, so they would not rely as much on the sign.

MOTION: Mike Scholz made a motion to go into deliberative

Ms. Skinner seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries.

Chairman Samsel noted the challenge is the proportion of the sign to the frontage of the building. From an aesthetic and safety standpoint 16 sq. ft. is not big enough and there will be safety concerns. In fairness to the potential tenants, the smaller signs are not appropriate; whoever writes the ordinances needs to take proportion into consideration.

Mr. Scholz noted there are only two businesses on one of the signs. Why does that sign need relief? What resonates from a proportion standpoint for him is the volume of businesses going on one sign.

Chairman Samsel noted for him it is the proportion of the sign to the size of the building and the frontage. He would like the height to be reduced.

Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria.

1. (contrary to public interest): meets the criteria
2. (spirit of the ordinance): meets the criteria
3. (substantial justice): meets the criteria
4. (value of surrounding properties): meets the criteria
5. (hardship): the argument for uniqueness is difficult. What is special about this property? The only argument he can think of is that it is close to Rt. 111. The center of the district is where the smaller signs would be appropriate. He does not believe it meets this criteria.

Mr. Partington added the public should decide what the frontage of Rt. 111 should look like.

Mr. Breton noted there is nothing really unique because all the businesses have frontage on Rt. 111.

Chairman Samsel noted they are jumping to the conclusion that others are going to come forward for larger signs. They only have those two signs before them. He would like to be clear to those that craft the ordinances that there needs to be some kind of change to adjust for proportion.

187
188 Mr. Scholz noted there is a significant parcel in the back that could be developed in the future.
189 Would the smaller sign be sufficient for those added businesses? He does not know what the public
190 wants, so he is unsure if it meets the spirit and intent of the ordinance. He does not believe lot 11-A-
191 530 meets the hardship criteria.

192
193 Chairman Samsel noted the board needed to be careful about being concerned with what the public
194 wants. The entire zoning ordinance is what the public wants. Everything that comes in front of the
195 board is a relief from what the public wants. Otherwise they are setting up a bias for every variance.
196 For this case, they heard testimony for and against.

197
198 Mr. Scholz noted lot 11-A-530 does not meet spirit, intent or hardship. For lot 11-A-520, there are a
199 number of businesses planned for that lot and he does not believe the size of the sign is viable to fit
200 that many businesses.

201
202 Chairman Samsel questioned if they should split the vote and vote for the height and size separately.
203 Mr. Breton did not think they should do that. If they were to do that, there should have been two
204 separate testimonies and applications.

205
206 Mr. Scholz noted they could revise the designs and come back with something different.

207
208 Ms. Skinner noted the applicant did suggest they would be open to a change in the height of the
209 signs. Should they consider that? Chairman Samsel did not believe it would change the outcome.

210
211 Chairman Samsel felt it met the criteria for backlighting. Mr. Partington did not believe it met the
212 hardship criteria. Mr. Breton noted, in their testimony they stated they could front light it if they
213 needed to, so he does not believe there is hardship.

214
215 Mr. Breton noted he is not comfortable with the height. He would be in favor of illumination.
216 He would rather it go wider than higher.

217
218 **MOTION: Mr. Partington made a motion to deny the variance from Section 706.8 for two (2)**
219 **free standing signs. Sign A on lot 11-A-530 to be (10) ft. high and 39 sq. ft. in area and Sign B**
220 **on lot 11-A-520 to be 12 ft. high and 60 sq. ft. in area in the Village Center District, where the**
221 **maximum height is 5 ft. and the maximum area is 16 sq. ft. per lot.**

222 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion.**

223 **No discussion.**

224 **Vote 4-1. Chairman Samsel against.**

225 **Motion carries.**

226
227 Mr. Scholz, Mr. Partington, Ms. Skinner and Mr. Breton noted it was the criteria for spirit, intent
228 and hardship that they did not meet.

229
230 Chairman Samsel noted there was a 30-day appeal period.

231
232 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to deny without prejudice a variance from Section**
233 **706.4.3.3 to allow internal illumination of cut-out imagery on the two (2) signs where internal**
234 **illumination is not allowed.**

Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.

No discussion.

Vote 5-0.

Motion carries.

Chairman Samsel noted there was a 30-day appeal period.

Lot 3-B-952 Case # 26-2016

Applicant Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc.

Owner-18 Depot Road LLC

Location-18 Depot Road

Zoning District-Rural

Variance relief is requested from **Section 702 App. A-1** for (lot 3-B-956) to allow a frontage of 134.53 ft. where 175 ft. is required. For lot (3-B-952) to allow a frontage of 134.60 ft., where 175 ft. is required, and will be 81.56% of the required lot area by soil type.

Lot 3-B-952, Case # 27-2016

Applicant-Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc.

Owner- 18 Depot Road LLC

Location- 18 Depot Road

Zoning District-Rural

Variance relief is requested from **Section 702 App. A-1** to allow frontage of 93.13 ft. on lot 952 where 175 ft. is required and will be 80.44% of the required lot area by soil type.

Mr. Cronin submitted Exhibit A which was photographs of the site.

The board felt it would be appropriate to hear both cases together since they were for the same lot.

John Cronin presented the application on behalf of the applicant.

The property has a single-family home situated close to the side lot line leaving a very large side yard. The goal when the owner acquired the property was to fix up the home and the adjacent lot and sell off both. There are two scenarios: one is to split the frontage so both lots have equal frontage; the other is to have one lot with the required frontage and seek a variance for the second lot. They will meet all other required setbacks. The purpose of the ordinance is to prevent overcrowding. There will be no burden on the safety, health and welfare to the community. Both lots would be consistent with the rest of the lots in the neighborhood. They are all about an acre. It would not alter the existing character of the neighborhood. By fixing up the home and the adjacent lot, they believe it would enhance the aesthetics and value of the surrounding properties.

Mr. Cronin noted there was a small lot at the front of the property. If they were able to acquire that parcel they would be very close to having the required frontage. The owner is not willing to sell the property at this time. There is historical value to the family.

The photographs provided are of the existing home and the distance from the house to the side lot line. The bottom pictures show the condition of the existing lot.

Chairman Samsel clarified where the driveways would go.

Mr. Partington confirmed they were subdividing the lot. Mr. Jay Yennaco, property owner, confirmed they were. The existing home would be staying in the same location.

Mr. Cronin read the five points into the record for both applications.

They are taking the lots and dividing the lots evenly. They discussed making one lot conforming so they would only need one variance, but they believe dividing the frontage is more inline with the spirit of the ordinance.

Mr. Partington questioned if they would be able to subdivide the property without variances if they were able to acquire the smaller lot. Mr. Cronin noted they would be about 8' short on the frontage, but they would meet the soil requirements.

Patricia Wilson Fowler, owner of lot 3-B-954

Ms. Fowler noted her family has owned lot 3-B-954 since the 1740s. It is the last remaining piece of land owned by their family. The ordinances are there for a reason. It looks like someone is just flipping the house and trying to make a grandfathered lot less legal and make a secondary lot short of what is required. She does not believe there is hardship. She is opposed to it on the basis of the smaller frontage.

Mr. Partington noted they have two sets of plans in front of them. One plan meets the setbacks, but in the other set of plans neither lot meets the requirements. Ms. Fowler noted she still sees numbers that are too low. She thinks the 90' frontage is too small and they are asking for quite a bit for a lot to be reduced to that, with the sole purpose of building in an area that does not want too much congestion. It is a historical area.

Tom Case

He was confused by the publication. He did not think it was clear that it was going to become two lots.

Don B. Cott, Pamela Cott, 14 Depot Road

Mr. Cott noted it would help his property values to see the property cleaned up. He likes that aspect of the project. His main concern is that there is a vernal pool on the back corner of that lot. If they build a house, will it change where the vernal pool goes and that water has to go somewhere? It is a good size vernal pool.

Ms. Cott noted there are flags in that area but was not sure what they were for. She is not only concerned with the drainage, she does not want to see the vernal pool disturbed.

Mr. Breton noted he would assume the applicant was aware that the vernal pool was there.

Jay Yennaco noted he has been enrooted in the town for a long time. His intent is never to do anything detrimental. He 100% understands where they are coming from. He is happy to work with them to preserve the vernal pool. He is just doing what he thinks is best. His intent is not to come in and bulldoze trees.

Mr. Cronin noted the applicant did have a wetland scientist go out and look at the property and it did not meet the classification of a vernal pool. They will have to demonstrate to the planning board that no drainage will impact any other properties and will need to be addressed on site. The planning board is very diligent about protecting wetlands.

Mr. Breton questioned if Ms. Fowler intended on keeping that property. She noted she would like to keep it as long as possible. Mr. Breton suggested they add a granite marker on the property to signify the history. The applicant agreed he would be willing to do that.

MOTION: Mike Breton made a motion to go into deliberative

Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries.

Ms. Skinner read a letter from conservation commission. They would prefer to see the small adjacent lot be purchased to prevent a smaller sized lot.

Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria.

1. (contrary to public interest): meets the criteria
2. (spirit of the ordinance): meets the criteria
3. (substantial justice): The benefit of splitting the lots is to the owner. There is a negative tax revenue when you split lots. He does not believe it meets this criteria.
4. (value of surrounding properties): meets the criteria
5. (hardship): he does not believe there is anything unique about the property. There is already a home there. He does not believe it meets this criteria.

Mr. Partington did not believe either plan met substantial justice or hardship.

Mr. Scholz thought the location of the home on the lot is different than the rest in the area. He did not have an issue with substantial justice.

Mr. Breton agreed with Mr. Scholz. They are fulfilling the intent of what the neighborhood looks like.

Chairman Samsel noted it is a historic district. They are larger sized lots than the average. The hardship being the smaller piece in the front that is historic value. If the lots had smaller acreage he would have a bigger concern. Because they are bigger it is more palatable. His concern is the proximity to the driveways across the street and the vernal pool.

Ms. Skinner noted she always remembers that being wet in the spring. That does indicate what would potentially be a vernal pool. We have had an unusually dry spring and summer.

Chairman Samsel believes all five points were met. Mr. Scholz agreed.

Chairman Samsel noted he was confident the planning board would have further discussion about the vernal pool.

Mr. Breton noted they could not require a granite marker but the applicant acknowledged they would be willing to do a nice granite marker that would be there forever.

MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relief for Section 702 App. A-1 for (lot 3-B-956) to allow a frontage of 134.53 ft. where 175 ft. is required. For lot (3-B-952) to allow a frontage of 134.60 ft., where 175 ft. is required, and will be 81.56% of the required lot area by soil type, as presented.

Mr. Breton seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 3-2. Mr. Partington and Ms. Skinner against.

Motion carries.

Mr. Partington noted it was substantial justice and hardship that it did not meet. Ms. Skinner agreed.

MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to deny without prejudice variance relief from Section 702 App. A-1 to allow frontage of 93.13 ft. on lot 952 where 175 ft. is required and will be 80.44% of the required lot area by soil type.

Mr. Breton seconded the motion.

No discussion.

Vote 5-0.

Motion carries.

Chairman Samsel noted there was a 30-day appeal period.

10:04 – 5 minute recess

Lot 3-A-640, Case # 28-2016

Applicant/Owner -Rebecca LaFrance

Location-23 Mitchell Pond Road

Zoning District-Rural & Wetland & Watershed Protection District (WWPD)

Variance relief is requested from **Section 601.3** to allow an in-ground pool in the WWPD.

Applying for a variance to put in an in-ground pool.

Ms. LaFrance presented the application and reviewed the five criteria. There is no where else on the property where they could put the pool. Many other homes in the neighborhood have pools. The entire buildable area of their yard is within the WWPD.

Chairman Samsel questioned the plans presented and whether the 20'x40' area indicated was just the pool or if it included the decking. Ms. LaFrance noted that was just the pool.

Michael LaFrance

Mr. LaFrance noted the patio decking will be between 1,100 and 1,500 sq. ft. and encompass the 20'x40'. It will be shaped around the pool with widths varying from 8'w to 14'w.

The filter house will be to the left on the decking. They are installing a salt-water pool, which requires fewer chemicals.

Ms. Skinner questioned if they could move the pool closer to the back of the house. Ms. LaFrance noted they were putting the pool as close as they could to the house.

Mr. Partington questioned if they would be open to a smaller pool. Ms. LaFrance noted they would be but started with a standard size.

Chairman Samsel noted in the past, they have received conceptual designs of the deck the pool and the contour to see the impervious coverage. Is the board comfortable with what they have been provided?

Mr. Breton noted he was comfortable with what was provided. It might change slightly when they begin construction. He has no issues.

Ms. Skinner read a letter from the conservation commission. They questioned if the pool could be moved closer to the house. They questioned where the chemicals would be discharged.

Mr. Scholz questioned if the sketch was to scale. Mr. LaFrance noted they were not. The pool company suggested they get the permit before doing drawings.

MOTION: Mike Scholz made a motion to go into deliberative

Mr. Breton seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries.

Mr. Partington reviewed the five points.

1. (contrary to public interest): the salt water helps meet this and should be a condition. Mr. Mazalewski suggested they should require that the pool not intrude the WWPD any further than what is indicated on the plan.
2. (spirit of the ordinance): meets the criteria
3. (substantial justice): meets the criteria
4. (value of surrounding properties): meets the criteria
5. (hardship): Because the property is unique, the location and slope of the land, location of wells and septic there is no other location on the lot for the pool. Meets the criteria.

The application is reasonable and meets all five criteria.

Mr. Scholz agreed it met all five criteria and also agreed with the two conditions to approval.

MOTION: Mr. Partington made a motion to grant the variance from Section 601.3 to allow an in-ground pool in the WWPD. The following conditions to apply:

- The pool be a salt water pool
- The picture of the pool on the plan provided is the maximum intrusion towards the wetland

Mr. Breton seconded the motion.

No discussion.

Vote 5-0.

Motion carries.

Chairman Samsel noted there was a 30-day appeal period.

Lots 21-C-80 & 21-C-70, Case # 29-2016

Applicant-Joseph Maynard

Owner-EB Rich, Inc.& Bernice Kowalski-Richards

Location-208 & 212 Range Road

Zoning District-Residence A, Cobbett's Pond & Canobie Lake Watershed Protection District
Variance relief from **Section 611.6.4.2** to allow two (2) of the lots to not meet the setbacks of the underlying district and **Section 616.2.3** to allow the most easterly lot (which is the only new house lot in the Cobbett's Pond & Canobie Lake Watershed Protection District) to be the only lot to be required to meet the Cobbett's Pond & Canobie Lake Watershed Protection District requirements.

Mr. Maynard reviewed the application. The project was previously before the board as an open space development. On the first lot, the location of the home was placed where it is to maintain minimum grades. If they were to move the location of the home to meet the driveway setback, they could not build it because of grades, which would approach 20%.

On the second lot, there is an abutting lot that has frontage on Range Rd. that has a driveway easement through the property. Because of where that driveway easement sits, to keep the proposed driveway at a maximum of 50' back from the ROW, they could not park a car in the driveway without blocking the easement. They are looking to have that driveway be 65-70' back.

For the final lot, there is a caveat in the ordinance that states if any portion of the property falls within the Cobbett's Pond/Canobie Lake watershed the entire site needs to be designed as if it was in that watershed. At their design review meeting, they discussed that was never the intent of the ordinance. The reason the ordinance was written that way was to prevent water from one watershed going into another watershed. There is no physical way to get drainage from one side of the site to the other. They are asking for relief to design the one lot for that watershed, but not the entire site.

Mr. Partington noted the way the notice was posted, it just listed the one lot that was going to meet the ordinance instead of listing the other lots. He would like to see the motion list the other lots. He questioned if that would include the open space lots as well? Mr. Maynard noted there is no drainage in the open space lots. They are essentially a buffer.

Mr. Maynard clarified they are requesting one lot be 175-225' back from the proposed road system; the other lot he is looking for 65-75'. Chairman Samsel questioned if that was a straight line to the road. Mr. Maynard noted it is the distance is from the private driveway and is a straight line to the base of the house.

Mr. Maynard read the five points into the record.

MOTION: Mike Scholz made a motion to go into deliberative

Mr. Breton seconded the motion.

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries.

521
522 Chairman Samsel believed the five points were met; especially the hardship criteria because of the
523 length of the driveways and the private road limiting what they could do.
524
525 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria and felt the project met all five points.
526
527 **MOTION: Mr. Partington made a motion to grant the variance relief from Section 611.6.4.2**
528 **to allow lot 21-C-70 to have a maximum of 210' front yard setback and lot 21-C-80 to have a**
529 **maximum 75' front yard setback and variance relief from Section 616.2.3 to allow lots:**
530 **21-C-A - open space, 21-C-B - open space, 21-C-70, 21-C-70-1, 21-C-70-2, 21-C-70-3, 21-C-C -**
531 **open space to not be required to meet Cobbett's Pond and Canobie Lake watershed**
532 **protection district requirements, per plans submitted**
533 **Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.**
534 **No discussion.**
535 **Vote 5-0.**
536 **Motion carries.**
537
538 Chairman Samsel noted there was a 30-day appeal period.
539
540 **7/12/16 Minutes**
541 These were already reviewed and approved.
542
543 **Correspondence**
544 Thank you note from Laura Scott.
545
546 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to adjourn at 10:58 p.m. Mr. Breton seconded the**
547 **motion.**
548 **Vote 5-0-0.**
549 **Motion passes.**
550
551 **Submitted by Andrea Cairns**